REMARKS

Applicant thanks the Examiner for the very thorough consideration given the present application. Claims 2 through 6, 9 through 14, 18, 19 and 22 through 67 are currently pending in the application. Claims 1, 7, 8, 15 through 17, 20 and 21 have been canceled. Claims 2, 9, 12, 18, 22, 23, 28, 41, 46, 49 and 53 have been amended. Claims 57 through 67 are newly presented. Bases for the amendments and support for the new claims can be found throughout the specification, claims and drawings as originally filed and as such, no new matter has been presented. The new claims are presented herein to provide the Applicant with a scope of protection commensurate with their contribution to the art.

Applicant also thanks the Examiner for the courtesies extended during a telephonic interview conducted on September 25, 2002. Details of the telephonic interview are set forth, below.

The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the objections and rejections in view of the above amendments and remarks set forth below.

Telephonic Interview

Once again, Applicant thanks the Examiner for the courtesies extended during a telephonic interview conducted on September 25, 2002.

During the telephonic interview, in which only the Examiner and the undersigned attorney participated, the "downwardly angled" tip portion limitation (e.g., "a tip portion that is angled downwardly toward the base portion") was discussed, as was the content of several references including U.S. Patent No. 2,181,966 to Dean, U.S. Patent No. 6,095,734 to Postadan et al. and U.S. Patent No. 5,919,019 to Fischer.

During the course of the interview, the undersigned attorney noted and the Examiner agreed that the Dean reference, as well as each combination of references

cited by the Office, had lacked a "downwardly angled" tip portion. Accordingly, the Examiner and the undersigned attorney were of the opinion that any claims that included the "downwardly angled" tip portion limitation were allowable over the art of record.

Although the Examiner and the undersigned attorney briefly considered various changes to the language of the claims to more concisely point out the angled or tapered configuration of the tip portion, it was agreed that a reference to Figures 5, 10 and 11 of the present application would sufficiently clarify the meaning of this limitation.

During the interview, the undersigned attorney explained that the "downwardly angled" tip portion limitation would have been pointed out and argued in Applicant's previous response but for the Examiner's indication (in a prior telephonic interview) that the addition of the "co-engaging" limitation to each of the independent claims would place the claims in condition for allowance. In view of the Examiner's reconsideration and subsequent rejection of the Applicant's amended claims (wherein the amendment added the co-engaging limitation), Applicant has respectfully requested, and the Examiner has agreed to enter the above claim amendments.

Claim Objections, Claim Amendments and Allowable Subject Matter

The Examiner has objected to Claims 3 and 4 as including allowable subject matter but being dependant upon a rejected base claim. Applicant has not elected to present Claims 3 and 4 in an independent form at this time, electing instead to pursue allowance of an intervening claim (i.e., Claim 2) from which Claims 3 and 4 depend. In this vein, Claim 2 has been presented in an independent form.

The Examiner has also objected to Claims 9 through 14, 18, 19 and 22 as including allowable subject matter but being dependant upon a rejected base claim. Claims 9, 12, 18 and 22 have been presented in an independent form to include all of the limitation of their base claim and any intervening claims. As Claims 10 and 11

depend from Claim 9, as Claims 13 and 14 depend from Claim 12 and as Claim 19 depends from Claim 18, Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 9 through 14, 18, 19 and 22 are in condition for allowance.

The Examiner has also noted that Claims 38 through 40 stand allowed.

Each of Claims 23, 24, 49 and 53 have been amended to remove a limitation that concerns the construction of each of the wing members of the resilient clip.

Claim 41 has been amended to include a "downwardly angled" limitation with respect to the tip portions of the resilient clip fastener.

Claims 57 through 67 are presented herein to provide the Applicant with a scope of protection commensurate with their contribution to the art. Applicant notes that Claims 57 through 63 depend from Claim 2, Claim 64 depends from Claim 23, Claim 65 depends from Claim 46, Claim 66 depends from Claim 49 and Claim 67 depends from Claim 53.

Applicant respectfully submits that bases for the amendments and support for the new claims can be found throughout the application, claims and drawings as originally filed and as such, no new matter has been added.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103

Applicant initially notes that during the telephonic interview on September 25, 2002, the Examiner had noted that the arguments made below were persuasive.

Rejections Based Primarily On Dean

The Examiner has rejected Claims 28, 29 and 32 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 2,181,966 to Dean. The Examiner has also rejected Claim 33 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No.

2,181,966 to Dean in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,251,467 to Anderson. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Applicant initially notes that the limitation "a tip portion that is angled downwardly toward the base portion" is illustrated in Figures 5, 10 and 11, for example, in the present application. Stated another way, the terminal or free (unattached) end of the tip portion is angled or tapered.

Applicant notes, too, that the Dean reference does not appear to teach or suggest a resilient clip having wing members that terminate at a downwardly angled tip portion. Rather, each of the holding portions (28, 30, 32, 34) of the Dean reference terminate at an edge (24) that lies in a horizontal plane.

Applicant further notes that (and the Examiner has admitted) that the Dean reference is silent as to the ratio of insertion force to pull-out force. Nonetheless, the Examiner has stated that the Dean clip:

> could provide a resilient clip with a ratio of insertion to pull-out force of about 0.4 to about 0.12. And even if the resilient clip does not comply with this ratio, one with ordinary skill in the art will recognize that the ratio could be achieved by changes [sic] the dimensions of the prior art until the desired ratio is obtained.

Accordingly, it appears that the rejection under Section 103 is based in large part on the Examiner's personal knowledge.

As the Examiner knows, the Examiner's ability to use personal knowledge is qualified by 37 C.F.R. 1.107, which states:

> When a rejection in an application is based on facts within the personal knowledge of an employee of the Office, the data shall be as specific as possible, and the reference must be supported, when called for by the applicant, by the affidavit of such employee, and such affidavit shall be subject to contradiction or explanation by the affidavits of the applicant or other persons.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner provide an affidavit supporting the Examiner's position that a) the Dean clip provides a ratio of insertion to pull-out force of about 0.4 to about 0.12 and b) that changes in the dimensions of the Dean clip will provide a ratio of insertion to pull-out force of about 0.4 to about 0.12.

As Applicant has noted in the subject application, there remains a need in the art for resilient clip fasteners having a relatively low installation force but a relatively high removal force. Given this need, Applicant submits that the solution of this problem could not be solved through mere dimensional changes to the known clip designs.

Applicant submits that the Dean reference does not teach or suggest a resilient clip having wing members that terminate at a downwardly angled tip portion or a resilient clip that provides a ratio of insertion to pull-out force of about 0.4 to about 0.12. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection of Claim 28 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

Applicant notes, too, that "if an independent claim is non-obvious under 35 U.S.C. 103, then any claim depending therefrom is non-obvious." *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d. 1071 (Fed. Cir. 1988). Accordingly, Applicant submits that Claims 29 through 33 are in condition for allowance as they depend from Claim 28.

Rejections Based Primarily On Postadan and Dean

The Examiner has rejected Claims 2 and 5 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,095,734 to Postadan et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 2,181,966 to Dean. The Examiner has rejected Claim 6 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,095,734 to Postadan et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 2,181,966 to Dean and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,251,467 to Anderson. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Applicant initially notes that Claim 2 includes the limitation wherein "each of the tip portions is angled", which is illustrated in Figures 5, 10 and 11, for example, in the present application. Stated another way, the terminal or free (unattached) end of the tip portion is angled or tapered.

Applicant notes, too, that neither the Postadan reference or the Dean reference appears to teach or suggest a resilient clip having wing members that terminate at a downwardly angled tip portion. In this regard, the inwardly depending portions (39) of the Postadan reference lie in a horizontal plane and each of the holding portions (28, 30, 32, 34) of the Dean reference terminate at an edge (24) that lies in a horizontal plane.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that the combination of the Postadan and Dean references does not appear to teach or suggest a resilient clip with wing members having an angled tip portion. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection of Claim 2 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

Applicant notes that Claims 3 through 6 depend from Claim 2 and as such should be in condition for allowance for the reasons set forth for Claim 2, above.

Rejections Based Primarily On Fischer and Dean

The Examiner has rejected Claims 23, 24, 26, 28, 30, 32, 34 through 36, 41, 42, 44 through 46 and 48 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,919,019 to Fischer in view of U.S. Patent No. 2,181,966 to Dean. The Examiner has rejected Claims 25 and 47 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,919,019 to Fischer in view of U.S. Patent No. 2,181,966 to Dean and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,251,467 to Anderson. The Examiner has rejected Claims 27, 31 and 37 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,919,019 to Fischer in view of U.S. Patent No. 2,181,966 to Dean and further in view of 6,179,366 to Hanz and U.S. Patent No. 5,704,753 to Ueno. The Examiner has rejected Claim 43 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,919,019 to Fischer in view of U.S. Patent No. 2,181,966 to Dean and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,095,734 to Postadan et al. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Applicant initially notes that independent Claims 23, 28, 34, 41 and 46 each include a limitation wherein the tip portions are downwardly angled, which is illustrated in Figures 5, 10 and 11, for example, in the present application. Stated another way, the terminal or free (unattached) end of the tip portion is angled or tapered.

Applicant notes, too, that neither the Fischer reference or the Dean reference appears to teach or suggest a resilient clip having wing members that terminate at a downwardly angled tip portion. In this regard, the terminal end of the outer end portions (50) of the Fischer reference lie in a horizontal plane and each of the holding portions (28, 30, 32, 34) of the Dean reference terminate at an edge (24) that lies in a horizontal plane.

Applicant respectfully submits that the combination of the Fischer and Dean references does not appear to teach or suggest a resilient clip with wing members having an angled tip portion. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection of Claims 23, 34, 41 and 46 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

Applicant notes that Claims 24 through 27 depend from Claim 23 and as such should be in condition for allowance for the reasons set forth for Claim 23, above.

Applicant notes that Claims 35 through 37 depend from Claim 34 and as such should be in condition for allowance for the reasons set forth for Claim 34, above.

Applicant notes that Claims 42 through 45 depend from Claim 41 and as such should be in condition for allowance for the reasons set forth for Claim 41, above.

Applicant also notes that Claims 47 and 48 depend from Claim 46 and as such should be in condition for allowance for the reasons set forth for Claim 46, above.

Additionally, Applicant notes that (and the Examiner has admitted that) the Fischer reference is silent as to the ratio of insertion force to pull-out force. Nonetheless,

the Examiner has stated that the Fischer clip when modified to include the wing members of the Dean reference:

> could provide a resilient clip with a ratio of insertion to pull-out force of about 0.4 to about 0.12. And even if the resilient clip does not comply with this ratio, one with ordinary skill in the art will recognize that the ratio could be achieved by changes [sic] the dimensions of the prior art until the desired ratio is obtained.

Accordingly, it appears that the rejection under Section 103 is based in large part on the Examiner's personal knowledge.

As the Examiner knows, the Examiner's ability to use personal knowledge is qualified by 37 C.F.R. 1.107, which states:

> When a rejection in an application is based on facts within the personal knowledge of an employee of the Office, the data shall be as specific as possible, and the reference must be supported, when called for by the applicant, by the affidavit of such employee, and such affidavit shall be subject to contradiction or explanation by the affidavits of the applicant or other persons.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner provide an affidavit supporting the Examiner's position that a) the modification suggested by the Examiner provides a resilient clip with a ratio of insertion to pull-out force of about 0.4 to about 0.12 and b) that changes in the dimensions of the prior art clips will provide a ratio of insertion to pull-out force of about 0.4 to about 0.12.

As Applicant has noted in the subject application, there remains a need in the art for resilient clip fasteners having a relatively low installation force but a relatively high removal force. Given this need, Applicant submits that the solution of this problem could not be solved through mere dimensional changes to the known clip designs.

Accordingly, Applicant submits that the combination of the Fischer and Dean references does not appear to teach or suggest a resilient clip with wing members having an angled tip portion or a resilient clip that provides a ratio of insertion to pull-out force of about 0.4 to about 0.12. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection of Claim 28 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

Applicant notes that Claims 29 through 33 depend from Claim 28 and as such should be in condition for allowance for the reasons set forth for Claim 28, above.

Rejections Based On Wisniewski and Dean

The Examiner has rejected Claims 49 through 53, 55 and 56 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,141,837 to Wisniewski in view of U.S. Patent No. 2,181,966 to Dean. The Examiner has rejected Claim 54 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,141,837 to Wisniewski in view of U.S. Patent No. 2,181,966 to Dean and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,367,751 to DeWitt. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Applicant initially notes that independent Claims 49 and 53 each include the limitation wherein "each of the tip portions is angled", which is illustrated in Figures 5, 10 and 11, for example, in the present application. Stated another way, the terminal or free (unattached) end of the tip portion is angled or tapered.

Applicant notes, too, that neither the Wisniewski reference or the Dean reference appears to teach or suggest a resilient clip having wing members that terminate at a downwardly angled tip portion. In this regard, the terminal end of the spring biased member (70' - *see, e.g.*, Figure 4) of the Wisniewski reference lie in a horizontal plane and each of the holding portions (28, 30, 32, 34) of the Dean reference terminate at an edge (24) that lies in a horizontal plane.

Applicant respectfully submits that the combination of the Wisniewski and Dean references does not appear to teach or suggest a resilient clip with wing members having an angled tip portion. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection of Claims 49 and 53 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

Applicant notes that Claims 50 through 52 depend from Claim 49 and as such should be in condition for allowance for the reasons set forth for Claim 49, above.

Applicant also notes that Claims 54 through 56 depend from Claim 53 and as such should be in condition for allowance for the reasons set forth for Claim 53, above.

CONCLUSION

All of the stated grounds of objection and rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding office action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned attorney at (248) 641-1600.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Michael D. Zalobsky
Reg. No. 45,512
HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

Date: November 4, 2002

The claims have been amended as follows:

2. (Amended) [The resilient clip of Claim 1,] A resilient clip for use in securing a first member to a second member, the resilient clip comprising:

a flange portion having an aperture, the aperture adapted to receive a threaded fastener to couple the second member to the flange portion;

an insertion portion configured to be inserted into a hole formed into the first member, the insertion portion being coupled to the flange portion; and

a retaining portion coupled to the insertion portion and having first and second wing members, the first wing member being twisted about a first axis in a first direction, the second wing member being twisted about a second axis in the first direction, each of the first and second wing members terminating at a tip portion, the tip portion of the first wing member and the tip portion of the second wing member being configured to co-engage the first member;

wherein each of the first and second axes are generally parallel a longitudinal axis of the retaining portion; and

wherein each of the tip portions is angled such that a [portion] lateral end of an associated one of the first and second wing members [nearest a centerline of the aperture in the flange portion is longer than a portion of the associated one of the first and second wing members farthest from the centerline of the aperture in the flange portion] extends above an opposite lateral end of the associated one of the first and second wing members.

9. (Twice Amended) [The resilient clip of Claim 1,] A resilient clip for use in securing a first member to a second member, the resilient clip comprising:

a flange portion having an aperture, the aperture adapted to receive a threaded fastener to couple the second member to the flange portion;

an insertion portion configured to be inserted into a hole formed into the first member, the insertion portion being coupled to the flange portion; and

a retaining portion coupled to the insertion portion and having first and second wing members, the first wing member being twisted about a first axis in a first direction, the second wing member being twisted about a second axis in the first direction, each of the first and second wing members terminating at a tip portion the tip portion of the first wing member and the tip portion of the second wing member being configured to co-engage the first member;

wherein each of the first and second axes are generally parallel a longitudinal axis of the retaining portion; and

wherein the retaining portion includes first and second abutting flanges having a base that is spaced vertically apart from the first and second wing members, respectively, each of the bases of the first and second abutting flanges being configured to abut a surface of the first member opposite a surface into which the first and second wing members, respectively, are engaged.

12. (Amended) [The resilient clip of Claim 1,] A resilient clip for use in securing a first member to a second member, the resilient clip comprising:

a flange portion having an aperture, the aperture adapted to receive a threaded fastener to couple the second member to the flange portion;

an insertion portion configured to be inserted into a hole formed into the first member, the insertion portion being coupled to the flange portion; and

a retaining portion coupled to the insertion portion and having first and second wing members, the first wing member being twisted about a first axis in a first direction, the second wing member being twisted about a second axis in the first direction, each of the first and second wing members terminating at a tip portion the tip portion of the first wing member and the tip portion of the second wing member being configured to co-engage the first member;

wherein each of the first and second axes are generally parallel a longitudinal axis of the retaining portion; and

wherein the insertion portion is defined by a pair of flanges that are spaced apart about a central axis of the resilient clip, each of the flanges having a first portion, a second portion and a third portion, the first portion being coupled to the flange portion and tapering inwardly toward the central axis and downwardly from the flange portion, the second portion being coupled to an end of the first portion opposite the flange portion and extending downwardly therefrom generally parallel the central axis, the third portion being coupled to an end of the second portion opposite the first portion and tapering outwardly away from the central axis and upwardly toward the flange portion.

18. (Amended) [The resilient clip of Claim 15,] A resilient clip for use in securing a first member to a second member, the resilient clip comprising:

a flange portion having an aperture, the aperture adapted to receive a threaded fastener to couple the second member to the flange portion;

an insertion portion configured to be inserted into a hole formed into the first member, the insertion portion being coupled to the flange portion;

a retaining portion coupled to the insertion portion and having first and second wing members, the first wing member being twisted about a first axis in a first direction, the second wing member being twisted about a second axis in the first direction, each of the first and second wing members terminating at a tip portion the tip portion of the first wing member and the tip portion of the second wing member being configured to co-engage the first member;

a spacing structure having first and second flange members, the first flange member being coupled to the flange portion, the second flange member being coupled to an outer edge of the first flange member and tapering downwardly toward the retaining portion and outwardly from the flange portion;

wherein each of the first and second axes are generally parallel a longitudinal axis of the retaining portion; and

wherein the spacing structure further includes a coupling member that engages and fixedly couples the flange portion to the spacing structure.

22. (Amended) [The resilient clip of Claim 15,] A resilient clip for use in securing a first member to a second member, the resilient clip comprising:

a flange portion having an aperture, the aperture adapted to receive a threaded fastener to couple the second member to the flange portion;

an insertion portion configured to be inserted into a hole formed into the first member, the insertion portion being coupled to the flange portion;

a retaining portion coupled to the insertion portion and having first and second wing members, the first wing member being twisted about a first axis in a first direction, the second wing member being twisted about a second axis in the first direction, each of the first and second wing members terminating at a tip portion the tip portion of the first wing member and the tip portion of the second wing member being configured to co-engage the first member;

a spacing structure having first and second flange members, the first flange member being coupled to the flange portion, the second flange member being coupled to an outer edge of the first flange member and tapering downwardly toward the retaining portion and outwardly from the flange portion;

wherein each of the first and second axes are generally parallel a longitudinal axis of the retaining portion; and

wherein the first flange member includes a recessed cavity sized to receive and locate the flange portion.

23. (Twice Amended) A resilient clip for engaging a structure, the resilient clip comprising:

a body portion having a pair of flanges, a pair of wing members and a pair of abutting members, each of the wing members having a base portion coupled to an associated one of the flanges, a first one of the wing members being twisted about a first axis in a first direction, a second one of the wing members being twisted about a second axis in the first direction, each of the wing members terminating at a tip portion that is angled downwardly toward the base portion [such that a portion of an associated one of the wing members nearest a central axis of the body portion extends above an associated portion of the wing member furthest from the central axis of the body portion], the tip portion of the wing members being configured to co-engage a first side of the structure and position a second side of the structure against the abutting members.

28. (Amended) In combination, a resilient clip for engaging a structure, the resilient clip comprising a body portion for insertion downwardly into a hole formed in the structure, the body portion including a plurality of wing members, each of the wing members having a base portion and terminating at a tip portion that is angled downwardly toward the base portion, each of the tip portions being twisted about an axis such that an inwardly twisted end of the tip portion is positioned [above] below an outwardly twisted end of the tip portion, the plurality of wing members cooperating with the structure to provide the resilient clip with a ratio of insertion force to pull-out force of about 0.04 to about 0.12.

41. (Twice Amended) A resilient clip for use in securing a first member to a second member, the resilient clip comprising:

a flange portion having an aperture, the aperture adapted to receive a threaded fastener to couple the second member to the flange portion;

an insertion portion configured to be inserted into a hole formed into the first member, the insertion portion being coupled to the flange portion; and

a retaining portion coupled to the insertion portion and having at least three wing members, each of the wing members being twisted about an associated axis and terminating at a downwardly angled tip portion, each tip portion being configured to co-engage the first member.

46. (Amended) A resilient clip for engaging a structure, the resilient clip comprising:

a body portion having a pair of flanges and four wing members, each of the wing members having a base portion coupled to an associated one of the flanges, a first one of the wing members coupled to a first one of the flanges and being twisted about a first axis in a first direction, a second one of the wing members coupled to the first one of the flanges and being twisted about a second axis in a second direction opposite the first direction, a third one of the wing members coupled to a second one of the flanges and being twisted about a third axis in the first direction, a fourth one of the wing members coupled to the second one of the flanges and being twisted about a fourth axis in the second direction opposite the first direction, each of the wing members terminating at a tip portion that is angled downwardly toward the base portion [such that a portion of each of the wing members nearest a central axis of the body portion extends above an associated portion of each of the wing members that is furthest from the central axis of the body portion], the tip portions being configured to engage a first side of the structure to secure the resilient clip to the structure.

49. (Twice Amended) A resilient clip for engaging a first structure to a second structure, the resilient clip comprising:

a body portion having a pair of flanges and first and second wing members, each of the wing members having a base portion coupled to an associated one of the flanges, the first wing member being twisted about a first axis in a first direction, the second wing member being twisted about a second axis in the first direction, each of the wing members terminating at a tip portion that is angled downwardly toward the base portion [such that a portion of each of the wing members nearest a central axis of the body portion extends above an associated portion of each of the wing members that is furthest from the central axis of the body portion], the tip portions being configured to engage a first side of the first structure to secure the resilient clip to the second structure.

53. In combination, a resilient clip for coupling a first structure to a second structure, the first structure including a fastening tab, the second structure including a clip aperture, the resilient clip including a body portion and an engagement portion, the body portion having a pair of flanges and first and second wing members, each of the wing members having a base portion coupled to an associated one of the flanges, the first wing member being twisted about a first axis in a first direction, the second wing member being twisted about a second axis in the first direction, each of the wing members terminating at a tip portion that is angled downwardly toward the base portion [such that a portion of each of the wing members nearest a central axis of the body portion extends above an associated portion of each of the wing members that is furthest from the central axis of the body portion], the tip portions being configured to engage a first side of the structure to secure the resilient clip to the second structure, the engagement portion having a plurality of teeth that extend inwardly toward the central axis of the body portion and downwardly toward the base portions of the wing members, the plurality of teeth being configured for engaging the first structure.